

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 29-35, 3-11, 14-22 and 25-27 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Mamiya et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,322) (hereafter Mamiya) in view of AAPA (Applicant Applied Prior Art). Applicant respectfully traverses in view of the following.

Independent Claim 33 recites a light conducting spacer conducting light through a reflective-type display from a backlight device, as claimed. The rejection relies on AAPA to show these limitations. Applicant respectfully traverses in view of the following.

AAPA discloses that one disadvantage of reflective display is the requirement that input assembly be rigid (see instant application, page 3, lines 8-9). Therefore, a space is maintained between the input assembly and the light guide to protect the microstructures from damage (see instant application, page 3, lines 12-13). For example, the space is maintained using glass balls, columns or pillars extending from a bottom layer to a top layer (see instant application, page 4, lines 4-12).

The space maintained using glass balls, columns or pillars, as disclosed by AAPA, does not teach or suggest a light conducting spacer conducting light, as claimed. As such, AAPA fails to teach or suggest a light conducting spacer conducting light through a reflective-type display from a backlight device in the claimed fashion.

Independent Claim 33 further recites that a light reflecting film reflects light conducted by the light conducting spacer back to the reflective-type display, as claimed.

In contrast, Mamiya discloses a back light where a light guiding sheet is attached to the back surface of the light guiding body (see Mamiya, col. 8, lines 21-25). The light reflected by the light guiding sheet has S-polarized components that are allowed to pass through by a polarizing plate (see Mamiya, col. 7, lines 35-40). The rejection equates the polarizing plate, as disclosed by Mamiya, to the light reflecting film, as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that a polarizing plate that allows S-polarized light to pass through, as disclosed by Mamiya, is silent with respect to reflecting light conducted by the light conducting spacer back to the reflecting-type display, as claimed. As such, Mamiya fails to teach or suggest that a light reflecting film reflects light conducted by the light conducting spacer back to the reflective-type display, as claimed.

Accordingly, Mamiya alone or in combination with AAPA fails to render independent Claim 33 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Independent Claims 34 and 35 recite limitations similar to that of Claim 33 that have been discussed and presented above. Thus, Claims 34 and 35 are patentable over Mamiya and AAPA for reasons similar to that of independent Claim 33. Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 34 is further patentable by reciting that the light reflecting film reflects light conducted by the light conducting spacer back to the reflective-type display to uniformly distribute light across the reflective-type display, as claimed. As presented above, Mamiya fails to teach or suggest the limitations that the light reflecting film reflects light conducted by the light conducting spacer back to the reflective-type display, as claimed. As such, Mamiya also fails to teach or suggest that the light reflecting film reflects light conducted by the light conducting spacer back to the reflective-type display to uniformly distribute light across the reflective-type display, as claimed.

Independent Claim 35 is further patentable by reciting that a brightness enhancing film (BEF) concentrates light toward the light conducting spacer to increase a brightness of the reflective-type display, as claimed. The rejection admits that Mamiya fails to teach a light conducting spacer, as claimed. Mamiya discloses that the quantity of light that is vertically emitted is increased (see Mamiya, col. 9, lines33-36). Thus, Mamiya fails to teach or suggest concentrating the light toward the light conducting spacer, as claimed because the rejection admits that Mamiya fails to teach a light conducting spacer, as claimed. As such, Mamiya fails to teach or suggest that a brightness enhancing film (BEF) concentrates light toward the light conducting spacer to increase a brightness of the reflective-type display, as claimed.

As per Claims 4, 15 and 26, Mamiya discloses a cool cathode tube (see Mamiya, col. 10, lines 45-46). A cool cathode tube, as disclosed by Mamiya, fails to explicitly teach or suggest at least one light emitting diode (LED), as claimed.

As per Claims 7, 8, 18, 19 and 29-30, the rejection states that the recited limitations claim the manner in which the claimed apparatus is intended to be employed. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The claimed limitations reciting that the reflective-type display is an electronic ink display, as claimed and that the reflective-type display comprises an electronic paper, as claimed respectively are not a manner of which the reflective-type display is used because they specifically recite “what” the reflective-type display is and “what” the reflective-type display comprises. As such, allowance of Claims 7, 8, 18, 19 and 29-30 is earnestly solicited.

As per Claims 10 and 21, the rejection asserts that Mamiya discloses that the reflective-type display further includes a plurality of light conducting spacer which enclose a area of the reflective-type display, as claimed. However, as presented above, the rejection admits that Mamiya fails to teach a light conducting spacer, as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is contradicting its own admission. As such, appropriate correction or clarification is earnestly requested.

As such, allowance of Claims 3-11, 14-22, 25-27 and 29-35 is earnestly solicited.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims 3-11, 14-22, 25-27 and 29-35 is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3-11, 14-22, 25-27 and 29-35 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 3-11, 14-22, 25-27 and 29-35 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,  
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 1-16-2009

/Amir A. Tabarrok/  
Amir A. Tabarrok  
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile